

LIBRARY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 18 1965

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

No. 644

THE UNITED GAS IMPROVEMENT COMPANY, *Petitioner*

v.

CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY, GENERAL CRUDE OIL COMPANY, M. H.
MARR, SUN OIL COMPANY, TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION COR-
PORATION, *Respondents*

No. 693

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, *Petitioner*

v.

M. H. MARR, SUN OIL COMPANY, CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY, GEN-
ERAL CRUDE OIL COMPANY, TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION COR-
PORATION, *Respondents*

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

**RESPONDENTS' OBJECTIONS TO MOTIONS FOR
LEAVE TO FILE BRIEFS AMICI CURIAE**

JOHN A. WARD, III
HERF M. WEINERT
Of Counsel

LLOYD F. THANEHUSER
THOMAS H. BURTON, JR.
Of Counsel

DONLEY C. WERTZ
JOHN T. GUYTON
Of Counsel

JACK D. HEAD
KEITH M. PYBURN
Of Counsel

Dated: March 17, 1965

ROBERT E. MAY
*Counsel for Respondent
Sun Oil Company*

DAVID T. SEARLS
Counsel for All Respondents

BRUCE R. MERRILL
*Counsel for Respondent
Continental Oil Company*

W. McIVER STREETMAN
*Counsel for Respondent
General Crude Oil Company*

STANLEY M. MORLEY
*Counsel for Respondent
M. H. Marr*

W. D. DEAKINS, JR.
*Counsel for Respondent
Texas Eastern Transmission
Corporation*





IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

No. 644

THE UNITED GAS IMPROVEMENT COMPANY, *Petitioner*

v.

CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY, GENERAL CRUDE OIL COMPANY, M. H.
MARR, SUN OIL COMPANY, TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION COR-
PORATION, *Respondents*

No. 693

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, *Petitioner*

v.

M. H. MARR, SUN OIL COMPANY, CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY, GEN-
ERAL CRUDE OIL COMPANY, TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION COR-
PORATION, *Respondents*

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

**RESPONDENTS' OBJECTIONS TO MOTIONS FOR
LEAVE TO FILE BRIEFS AMICI CURIAE**

The Respondents M. H. Marr, Sun Oil Company, Continental Oil Company, General Crude Oil Company, and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation were served on or about March 12, 1965 with copies of Motions for Leave to File Briefs Amici Curiae by the following Applicants:

- (a) In Case No. 693, Motion of the People of the State of California and the Public Utilities

Commission of the State of California for Leave to File Brief Amici Curiae in Support of Petitioner;

- (b) In Cases No. 644 and No. 693, Motion for Leave to File Brief of the Southern California Gas Company, Southern Counties Gas Company of California, and Pacific Lighting Gas Supply Company, as Amici Curiae.

Each motion states that the consent of the Petitioners in such cases has been obtained, and that the consent of the Respondents has been refused, or has not been obtained. Pursuant to Rule 42(3) of the Revised Rules of this Court, Respondents state below their reasons for withholding consent.

Reasons for Withholding Consent

1. None of the Applicants claims to be entitled to file a brief Amicus Curiae without consent under Rule 42(4), and no Applicant qualifies for such privilege. The brief of the Public Utilities Commission on behalf of the People of the State of California is not that of a state sponsored by its attorney general, nor that of a political subdivision of a state, but rather it is the brief of an agency of a state, to which the privilege does not extend.

2. Neither motion sets forth facts or questions of law that have not been presented by the parties Petitioner, the Federal Power Commission and The United Gas Improvement Company, whose briefs are now before the Court.

3. Neither motion presents any reason for believing that facts or questions of law relevant to the disposi-

tion of the cases will not be presented adequately by the parties Petitioner.

4. The motions show that Applicants' claimed interest in the subject matter of the cases is remote and speculative, concerned only with the conjectural impact in the future of a decision in these cases.

5. The additional or novel facts offered by Applicants in their motions have no relevancy to the disposition of the cases, but on the contrary are pertinent solely to the Applicants' unsuccessful effort to show that they have some direct and legitimate interest in the outcome.

The motions of Applicants for leave to file briefs amici curiae should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN A. WARD, III
HERF M. WEINERT
Of Counsel

LLOYD F. THANHOUSER
THOMAS H. BURTON, JR.
Of Counsel

DONLEY C. WERTZ
JOHN T. GUYTON
Of Counsel

JACK D. HEAD
KEITH M. PYBURN
Of Counsel

Dated: March 17, 1965

ROBERT E. MAY
Counsel for Respondent
Sun Oil Company

DAVID T. SEARLS
Counsel for All Respondents

BRUCE R. MERRILL
Counsel for Respondent
Continental Oil Company

W. McIVER STREETMAN
Counsel for Respondent
General Crude Oil Company

STANLEY M. MORLEY
Counsel for Respondent
M. H. Marr

W. D. DEAKINS, JR.
Counsel for Respondent
Texas Eastern Transmission
Corporation